

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

MBSC Property South, LLC

Plaintiff,

VS.

The City of Myrtle Beach, South
Carolina,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 4:25-cv- 1475 JD

**DEFENDANT CITY OF MYRTLE
BEACH'S RESPONSES TO LOCAL RULE
26.01 INTERROGATORIES**

Defendant City of Myrtle Beach, by and through its undersigned attorneys, submits the following answers to the interrogatories as required by Local Rule 26.01:

(A) State the full name, address, and telephone number of all persons or legal entities who may have a subrogation interest in each claim and state the basis and extent of that interest.

Response: None known at this time.

(B) As to each claim, state whether it should be tried jury or nonjury and why.

Response: Plaintiff's Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Causes of Action should be tried to a jury because Plaintiff has requested a jury trial and they are actions at law. Plaintiff's First Cause of Action should be tried nonjury because it seeks declaration of the law and equitable relief.

(C) State whether the party submitting these responses is a publicly-owned company and separately identify (1) any parent corporation and any publicly-held corporation owning ten percent (10%) or more of the party's stock; (2) each publicly-owned company of which it is a parent; and (3) each publicly-owned company in which the party owns ten percent (10%) or more of the outstanding shares.

Response: The City of Myrtle Beach is not a publicly-owned company.

(D) State the basis for asserting the claim in the division in which it was filed (or the basis of any challenge to the appropriateness of the division). *See* Local Civ. Rule 3.01 (D.S.C.).

Response: This action was originally filed in South Carolina Circuit Court in Horry County. The City of Myrtle Beach removed this action on March 6, 2025, and cases removed from the Horry County Circuit Court are to be filed in the Florence Division of this Court.

(E) Is this action related in whole or in part to any other matter filed in this district, whether civil or criminal? If so, provide (1) a short caption and the full case number of the related action; (2) an explanation of how the matters are related; and (3) a statement of the status of the related action. Counsel should disclose any cases which *may be* related regardless of whether they are still pending. Whether cases *are* related such that they should be assigned to a single judge will be determined by the Clerk of Court based on a determination of whether the cases arise from the same or identical transactions, happenings, or events; involve the identical parties or property; or for any reason would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.

Response: Not to the City of Myrtle Beach's knowledge.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLOUGHBY HUMPHREY & D'ANTONI, P.A.

/s/ R. Walker Humphrey, II

R. Walker Humphrey, II, Fed. Bar No. 12524

James T. Johnson, SC Bar No. 14418

133 River Landing Drive, Suite 200

Charleston, South Carolina 29492

Telephone Number: 843-619-4426

whumphrey@whdlawyers.com

jjohnson@whdlawyers.com

Mitchell Willoughby, Fed. Bar No. 4702

Hunter R. Pope, Fed. Bar No. 13778

Post Office Box 8416

Columbia, South Carolina 29202

Telephone Number: 803-252-3300

mwilloughby@whdlawyers.com

hpope@whdlawyers.com

Attorneys for Defendant City of Myrtle Beach

March 10, 2025

Charleston, South Carolina